

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to call for transmitting a message, together with an instruction to control an activity of a recipient of said message. The recipient, for example, could be a base station or an end user. Examples of the types of control that may be specified include those set forth in claim 2, namely, to cause the base station to transmit the message at a predetermined time or claim 10 calls for disabling of the ringing function at the recipient. Neither of these conditions, or the generic conditions set forth in claim 1, are taught in any of the cited references.

While there is a suggestion that Adams teaches what is specified in claim 10, in Adams, the way that ringing is disabled is for the user of the telephone that is receiving the call to press a button. There is no sending of any instruction that disables ringing at a remote station.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1, dependent claim 2, and dependent claim 10 is respectfully requested.


On the same basis as reconsideration is requested of claim 10, reconsideration is requested with respect to claim 13.

Similarly, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 19 is requested on the same basis as claim 1. Likewise, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 24 is requested on the same basis as reconsideration was requested on claim 1.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 12, 2007



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation